

REMARKS

In response to the above Office Action, claim 1 has been amended to avoid the rejection of the claim under §112, second paragraph and to more specifically claim applicants' invention. More particularly, claim 1 now recites that a "total thickness of two layers of the double glass cloth is 10 μm or more and 400 μm or less, and an average length of a smaller side of a gap enclosed by warps and wefts is between 0 μm and 50 μm ." Support for this can be found at page 16, line 20 to page 17, line 9 and at page 18, line 23 to page 19, line 2 of the specification. As noted therein, it is possible to effectively improve the workability and quality of an extremely thin glass cloth when the total thickness of the two layers of the double glass cloth is 10 μm or more and 400 μm or less. Further, it is possible to improve the quality of holes worked or made using a drill or laser when the gap length is between 0 μm and 50 μm .

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for being anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,175,034 to De La Porte et al., hereafter De La Porte. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-4 for being anticipated by or in the alternative for being obvious over JP 56-58024 to Nishimura et al., hereafter Nishimura.

Neither of the above features is disclosed in either reference. Thus it is not believed amended claim 1 or claims 2-4 dependent therefrom can be considered to be anticipated by De La Porte or Nishimura. Their withdrawal as grounds of rejection under §102(b) is therefore requested.

Moreover, since the above mentioned improvements in the workability and quality of extremely thin glass cloth, and the quality of holes made using a drill or laser that are obtained as a result of these features would not be expected from the teachings

of De La Porte or Nishimura, it is submitted that the claims should not be considered obvious over the references either.

In addition, the invention of amended claim 1 has a significantly advantageous effect in that it can provide excellent productivity and rigidity and has the effect of being able to reduce variations in the amount of dimensional change and reduce a coefficient of thermal expansion in the thickness direction. See page 9, line 10 to page 10, line 8 of the specification. These advantages are a result of satisfying all of the features recited in amended claim 1.

Withdrawal of the cited references as grounds of rejection under §103(a) is therefore also requested.

Non-elected claims 5-7 and 9 have been cancelled to advance the prosecution of this application.

It is believed claims 1-4 are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 2, 2008

By:



Arthur S. Garrett
Reg. No. 20,338
(202) 408-4091